Information Note 120668
Purdue University

Documentation of Analysis Results

The procedure for documenting analysis results is set forth in this information note. This procedure is an answer to an obvious need for a plan of preservation and dissemination of analysis results within LARS and a standard method of reporting these results. Adherence to this procedure can save future duplication of effort, ease report and paper writing efforts, and increase the speed of communicating current results to all interested staff members. The cooperation of the LARS staff in observing the procedure outlined below is earnestly requested.

STATEMENT OF SCOPE: Every major analysis task should be documented by the primary experimenter. The program leaders will define the major analysis tasks and request the documentation when the primary experimenter is assigned.

DOCUMENTATION PROCEDURE: An Experiment File will be maintained according to the following procedure:

> The primary experimenter will be responsible to put together an original documentation package. A copy of the package (not including the computer printouts) should be sent to the Program Leaders and Associate Program Leaders and one copy circulated to everyone else. Anyone wishing a copy can obtain it from the file. Persons

having comments or questions are encouraged to add them to the documentation package in the form of a memo.

DOCUMENTATION PACKAGE: The documentation package should include the following and can include more if the primary experimenter desires.

1. Project Title:	Very brief description of project.
2. Experimenter(s):	Names of primary and other experimenters.
3. Objectives:	Paragraph describing the objectives of the experiment.
4. Data Used:	List of data used in experiment; e.g. aircraft run number, ground truth, etc.
5. Description of Data:	Description of data, listing cover types present, and cover types to be classified.
6. Preclassification Work:	Description of results obtained using the Statistics and Select processors. Include discussion on class decisions, wavelength band decisions, etc.
7. Classification Results:	a. Discuss and file the best results obtained showing training and test fields. b. Discuss and file the tabular results on a per field and class

basis for training samples and test samples.

c. Include the following table using all test fields:

	Number of Test Fields	Number of Test Fields Classified Above 70%
Class 1	46	40
Class 2	22	21
.	.	.
.	.	.
Class X	35	32
Totals	172	163

8. Discussion of results:

a. Of the total number of remote sensing units (RSU's) classified give the percentage which were included in the test fields and discuss why the other samples were not used.

b. Discuss why fields are incorrectly classified.

c. Discuss other classification results if any which led to the final result (no computer outputs required).

9. Conclusions:

Address yourself to the objectives in item 3.

a. Make generalized comments.

b. Did this project show something not previously examined? What?

c. Did this project reinforce earlier results?

d. Recommendations for further work.